

LSI Docket No. 03-2043

Remarks/Arguments

In the Office Action mailed on 1 June 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Hauck (United States Patent Number 6,912,669) and rejected claims 4-5, 15-16, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Hauck in view of well known features of which official notice is taken. The Examiner objected to claims 2-3, 6-7, 11, 13-14, and 17-18 as dependent from rejected claims but found them otherwise allowable if appropriately re-written. Claim 9 is allowed.

Though the Office Action Summary sheet of the Office Action suggests that claim 8 is rejected, the Examiner's remarks offer no basis for such a rejection. Applicants can offer no response to the rejection since no basis of the rejection is provided. However, Applicants note the similarity between claim 8 and claim 19 and presume for purposes of advancing prosecution hereof that the Examiner may have intended to reject claim 8 for reasons similar to those stated in rejecting claim 19.

Applicants traverse the rejections and request reconsideration and withdrawal thereof. Allowable claims 2, 11, and 13 have been canceled with their respective recitations incorporated into the corresponding base claims 1, 10, and 12.

§102 and §103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-5, 10, 12, 15-16, and 19 (and presumably claim 8) variously under §102 or §103 as anticipated by Hauck or obvious in view of Hauck and well known features of which official notice is taken.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and may elect to pursue broader protections in a continuing application. However, in hopes of advancing prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, and 12 to incorporate recitations of allowable claims 2, 11, and 13, respectively. Claims 2, 11, and 13 have therefore been canceled. Claims 3 and 14 have been amended to correct their dependency on now canceled claims. In view of these amendments, Applicants maintain that amended independent claims 1, 10, and 12 and independent claim 9 are allowable as indicated by

LSI Docket No. 03-2043


the Examiner. Remaining dependent claims 3-8 and 14-19 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the allowed claims and as dependent from allowable base claims.

Conclusion

Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, and 12 to overcome the Examiner's rejections by incorporating recitations of claims 2, 11, and 13 and have therefore cancelled claims 2, 11, and 13. Other claims (3 and 14) have been amended to correct dependencies on now canceled claims. Applicants have responded to the Examiner's rejections by amending claims 1, 10, and 12, have traversed the rejections, and hereby request reconsideration and withdrawal of same.

No additional fees are believed due. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel N. Fishman #35,512
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)